

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the language.

Claims 3-11 have been added to claim different aspects of the disclosed subject matter of the application.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Croy et al. (US Patent 6,476,825, hereinafter “Croy”). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 1, Croy does not disclose a setting portion which sets a target menu being displayed on a display portion as a direct execution menu and one or more direct-execution instructing portions which instruct an electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Croy discloses “direct-execution-menu setting means for setting the menu being displayed on said display means as a direct execution menu (col. 5, lines 15-21; col. 7, lines 47-67; col. 8, lines 1-22); and direct-execution instructing means for instructing to execute the menu set as the direct execution menu (col. 5, lines 15-21; col. 7, lines 47-67; col. 8, lines 1-22).” Applicants respectfully disagree. Croy discloses a remote device 200 with a display unit 240 that shows menus or selection lists preferably in the form of “Ping Pong Menus” (column 7, lines 47-51 and lines 65-67). In Croy, selection can be performed by using keys 310 and 311 to control functions displayed in the display (column 7, lines 52-57 and Figs. 16-17). As shown in Fig. 3 of Croy, a

user uses keys 310 and 311 to select an item in a menu in the display by pressing any of the key right next to the menu item in the display. Therefore, contrary to claim 1, the keys 310 and 311 are not set to a menu directly executed by the key. In other words, the user cannot execute a menu without seeing the menu in the display and pressing a key among the keys 310 and 311 right next to the menu displayed in the display. Also in Croy, the term “Ping Pong Menus” refers to a selection of one item from a selection list on one side of the display 240 causing a new menu or submenu for further selections to appear on the other side of the display 240 and further user selection causes a new menu or submenu to appear on the original side of the display 240 (column 8, lines 5-6 of Croy). A “Menu” selection allows the user to activate the menu hierarchy from the top. In this way, the user can go all the way back to the beginning and begin a new sequence of function selections and submenu displays (column 8, lines 17-22 of Croy). Therefore, Croy’s remote device 200 is rather similar to the conventional electronic device described in the application (page 6, line 23-page 7, line 9 of application). Croy does not disclose a setting portion which sets a target menu as a direct execution menu and one or more direct-execution instructing portions which instruct an electronic device to directly execute the direct execution menu as required in claim 1. Further, Croy discloses that often selected items are automatically recorded and appeared on the first (or topmost) positions and the least often selected items will slide to the lower positions (column 8, lines 23-30 of Croy). Croy’s often selected items are always first shown in the display and selected by the keys 310 and 311, and therefore Croy needs at least two steps to execute the often selected items. To the contrary, in claim 1, once the direct-execution-menu is set, the direct-execution menu can be directly executed. Therefore, Croy’s function to display often selected items on the first positions is different from the features of claim 1. Croy also discloses that the remote device 200 is coupled

to a base 100, and the base 100 can transmit data to the remote device 200 in case the remote device 200 lost such data during changing batteries (column 5, lines 1-2 and column 5, lines 17-20 of Croy). However, contrary to claim 1, Croy does not disclose that the remote device 200 or base 100 sets or saves direct-execution menu. Because Croy does not disclose each and every feature set forth in claim 1, Croy does not anticipate claim 1.

The remaining claims depend on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36205.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

Date: June 19, 2007

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg.No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700